

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BROWN COUNTY ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

Pursuant to Section 19.84 Wis. Stats., a regular meeting of the **Brown County Administration Committee** was held on Thursday, June 27, 2013 in Room 200, Northern Building, 305 E. Walnut Street, Green Bay, Wisconsin.

Present: Chair Fewell, Supervisor De Wane, Supervisor Steffen, Supervisor Jamir
Excused: Supervisor Carpenter
Also Present: Troy Streckenbach, Juliana Ruenzel, Lynn Vanden Langenberg, Brent Miller, Supervisor Nicholson, Supervisor Moynihan

I. Call to Order.

The meeting was called to order by Chair Steve Fewell at 5:00 p.m.

II. Approve/Modify Agenda.

Items 6 – 18 were removed from the agenda.

Motion made by Supervisor De Wane, seconded by Supervisor Jamir to approve as amended. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

III. Approve/Modify Minutes of June 6, 2013 and Joint Meeting of June 6, 2013.

Motion made by Supervisor De Wane, seconded by Supervisor Jamir to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Comments from the Public. *None.*

1. Review of minutes:

a) Housing Authority (May 20, 2013).

Motion made by Supervisor De Wane, seconded by Supervisor Steffen to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Commendation:

1b. Approval of Commendation Honoring Jeff Fonferek and Pearly Gates.

Supervisor De Wane stated that Jeff Fonferek has been holding a fundraiser bike ride for veterans for the past 8 – 9 years. He also has picnics and other functions for veterans and their families. Fonferek has raised \$400,000 - \$500,000 or more for veterans and De Wane will provide updated information in time for the presentation of the commendation at the July 13 fundraiser bike ride.

Fewell questioned if the Veterans Recognition Subcommittee was still functioning and it was indicated that it was. He felt that that a referral to that Subcommittee may have been more appropriate and perhaps this should have gone to Human Services as Veterans Services falls under the Human Services Committee. It was asked if this commendation will be presented to Fonferek prior to the next Board meeting and it was indicated that it would. De Wane would like to have the commendation signed by the Board Chair and Vice Chair as well as County Clerk Juno and County Executive Streckenbach. Supervisor Moynihan indicated that it would not be a problem to obtain these signatures prior to July 13.

Streckenbach stated that his office could handle this commendation if De Wane did not desire to have this presented at the full County Board meeting.

Motion made by Supervisor Steffen, seconded by Supervisor Jamir to refer to the County Executive for drafting of Commendation. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Communications:

2. **Communication from Supervisor Steffen re: Amendment to Resolution #10h, upon passage of Resolution #10h. Brown County shall begin submitting monthly invoices for all costs associated with the referenced resolution to the following state-level offices and departments: Department of Administration, State of Wisconsin; Office of the Governor; Association of State Prosecutors (cc: via e-mail only); Office of every State Government Assembly and Senate representing Brown County (cc: via e-mail only); Wisconsin State Journal (cc: via e-mail only); Green Bay Press Gazette (cc: via e-mail only). *Referred from April Cty. Board/Held for one month.***

Supervisor Steffen stated that the underlying resolution that this is related to was the financial support of the additional district attorney position that was authorized and this is something that should have been paid for by the State, although, because of the backlog and the Board's desire to maintain the commitment to public safety in the community it was decided to assume the financial responsibility for the additional position for a period of time even though it is a State expense. Steffen continued that his thought was that perhaps this would present an opportunity to submit invoices and make people aware that this is in fact a State expense and more than anything it would be a routine reminder to other levels of government that this is a State expense. He stated that sometimes the squeaky wheel gets the oil and he would be hopeful that this process would help that happen but he felt it may be helpful to be clear as to Brown County's continuing discontent with the way that funding, or lack thereof, is occurring. Steffen stated that he is open to other thoughts on this and a discussion followed.

Fewell asked Director of Administration, Brent Miller, if this is done by e mail what kind of time and/or expense would be incurred by his Department. Steffen interjected that there were a couple of entities that were listed as receiving actual invoices and others for a distribution e mail list but he was willing to look at compromises.

County Executive Troy Streckenbach stated that he understands the purpose behind this communication, however, he suggested that his office provide the County Board office with the appropriate information and this communication would then go to the suggested parties from the legislative body. He understands that we do want to send a message to the State regarding the fact that Brown County has taken the initiative in this matter and have decided locally to take on these things, but he does not know what the end result would be. Streckenbach continued that if we do this, he felt we may be opening ourselves up to the question if we should be doing this in a lot of other instances where there are multiple unfunded mandates that are required by the State and Federal governments.

Fewell asked Streckenbach where the County Board and the County are authorizing money for employees because this is the only area he knows where money is authorized for State employees. He felt these should be State paid employees and he cannot think of another area where this is being done. Streckenbach stated that in the Human Services budget there have been positions added and in some cases are simply writing out a check to manage community programs that are not necessarily in the picture State funded. What Streckenbach is suggesting is that while we can go through the process of sending an invoice out, this is more of a legislative type of position that we want a reminder that we are funding these positions because the State is not.

The second thing that Streckenbach wanted to be mindful of is that our District Attorney had a position on pay progression and when they went down to the State and lobbied for more attorneys, the question was

asked if they want pay progression instead of more attorneys. If we do send the invoices out and the communication is sent through, Streckenbach does not know what message is being sent and if it is accomplishing the intent behind it. He agrees with the idea and he has been harping to State legislators to put an end to unfunded mandates. Fewell stated that he felt that it would be a different resolution than funding for what are considered State employees. What Brown County is funding are State employees. He would agree to the unfunded mandates as Streckenbach referenced and Fewell felt it would be wise of another supervisor to put forward another resolution saying that we want the State to quit requiring unfunded mandates. Fewell continued that he does not have a problem saying to the State that Brown County does not appreciate unfunded mandates and quit putting mandates on us that they will not fund.

Steffen indicated that other methods that have been attempted seem to not have been effective such as drafting resolutions. This seems to be an exercise that the Board enjoys and spends hours debating regardless of the merit of the item. It has not generated results and yet we continue to choose that method. He also stated that we work with the Wisconsin Counties Association and questioned the outcome we receive from that. He stated that this is recognition that whatever we are doing now is not working. To say to draft a resolution for the Board and then have it sent off to wherever and people receive it once and then discard it. If this isn't the method that will be effective, he would like to find a method that is effective or some personnel working on these issues on our behalf in a much stronger fashion. Steffen acknowledged that those resources are not available in the Executive office at this time, but he does not believe the resolutions are effective and the intent was to design something that was a reoccurring pressure on legislators as well as the media to be aware that this is a continuing concern of ours.

Fewell questioned if this would be done on a monthly basis and Steffen stated that his intent was to have it done monthly. Streckenbach asked what if we were to draft a letter with numbers and our position of what we feel is behind the communication and then on a quarterly basis send this as a reminder to the State legislature because ultimately they are who will make the decision that the County has done this and provide the results of what has come from adding the new DA.

Fewell felt strongly that the legislative body and the administration strongly ask for more district attorney positions and he does not care with the State district attorneys association's position is on pay progression. What we are looking at is what the Brown County taxpayers have to say and that is that we are paying for positions that we should not have to pay for and to remind them of that and the fact that we need more positions funded, to Fewell is appropriate and legislatively he is all for that because he really thinks that it may be a little disingenuous of the District Attorney to go and lobby for pay progression and come back to the Board and ask for positions.

Streckenbach stated that the slippery slope that is before us is that the State loves when local government takes on their responsibility because eventually they stop funding it. That is a slippery slope when municipal government takes on other responsibilities of the State. Streckenbach stated that he felt this could be accomplished by showing not only what we are paying for but also the direct result and then incorporate this concept.

**Motion made by Supervisor Steffen, seconded by Supervisor De Wane to approve. No vote taken.
Motion withdrawn by Supervisor Steffen.**

Motion made by Supervisor Steffen, seconded by Supervisor Jamir to refer to the County Executive's office for creating and distributing a quarterly communication to the Board, state legislators and the media regarding our concerns with this issue and other prorated matters. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

3. **Communication from Supervisor Nicholson re: Review the position of Deputy Corporation Counsel.**

Supervisor Nicholson asked why there was no closed session listed for this item as he had requested. Fewell stated that there is no closed session language except for disciplinary hearings for which charges need to be brought. Nicholson stated that he had asked Chair Moynihan about this. Moynihan responded that Nicholson had asked how to bring this forward and Moynihan told him to bring it to Admin. Nicholson stated the one question he had of the committee members is whether the Deputy Corporation Counsel position is warranted.

Supervisor Jamir asked why it would not be warranted and Nicholson responded that in light of the fiasco with the information Supervisor Steffen requested and what was seen at the Executive Committee meeting a month ago, this was brought to Administration Committee to see if they felt this position was warranted due to what happened. Jamir stated that his recollection was that this relates to a matter of interpretation and Deputy Corporation Counsel interpreted one way and in that respect Deputy Corporation Counsel did her job and based on the information and her interpretation counseled Supervisor Steffen and at that point Corporation Counsel Ruenzel had a different interpretation. Jamir did not feel that this meant the position was not warranted and he felt the position was warranted.

Moynihan stated that this could be a discussion when it comes to budget time. Fewell felt that ultimately when it comes to any position in the County, it comes back to asking the County Executive and the head of the department to evaluate the position and we need to trust the evaluations. It is his understanding that there is a significant backlog when it comes to legal issues in the County and he felt that the position in question is necessary. He also noted that historically there has always been a Corporation Counsel and an Assistant Corporation Counsel. A number of the other assistant Corp. Counsel positions are doing work for parental rights and other family related issues.

Streckenbach said that he could only speak for the two years he has been here, but he felt that he could safely state that former Corporation Counsel John Luetscher was completely overwhelmed with the backlog. Streckenbach also stated that internally they were getting a lot of comments from departments because they had legal questions and contracts and other things that were not getting addressed in a timely manner. That was directly due to the fact that there was only one attorney that was handling all of the contracts. The other attorneys mentioned earlier are hired attorneys by Human Services and are handling mainly child abuse, sexual assault, termination of parental rights and other matters. Under those attorneys we have the child support attorneys who handle the child support issues only. Of all of the attorneys shown in the table of organization, there is only one attorney doing corporate work for all of the departments in the County. Luetscher asked for a part-time attorney when he was here and this year a full-time position was requested. Streckenbach felt they could showcase what the workload is that they are working on.

De Wane stated he did not want to speak for Nicholson, but what he has noticed in the past is that we hire attorneys but they are only specialized in one area and then they need someone to help with other matters outside of those specialties so they hire someone that can specialize in that and then we turn around and hire another attorney because the first two do not specialize in something. It appears to De Wane that we hire a lot of assistant corporation counsels. He felt that we should look to be hiring attorneys with broader experience that can handle more than one area.

Streckenbach stated that the positions that have been hired have been in the budget. Ruenzel stated that the Corporation Counsel office cannot be experts in everything. She continued that if you look in the statutes there are millions of laws, but her deputy and her generally handle 90% of the information. Her deputy and her handle all of the legal research, the writing, the resolutions, the ordinances, the litigation, the requests for proposals, quotes, bid, open records, open meetings, closed meetings, employment issues and she could go on and on.

De Wane was surprised that they did not go back and look at the past when they knew it was brought up before and spend that much time on something that is already in the documents. De Wane did not understand how so many hours were spent on an issue when the issue was already researched by the previous corporation counsel. Ruenzel stated that generally they look back in the files to see if there is anything there. If there is nothing in the files, you have to start with research and she noted that the issue in question was not part of the filing system that they have that they could find.

Fewell stated his understanding of this issue is that Ruenzel was not even on staff and the background she had when she came forward was that it was not possible to have term limits and this may well have been research that Ruenzel had done somewhere else. Ruenzel confirmed that this was something she had learned years ago. Fewell continued that in this matter the interim corporation counsel did some work and when Ruenzel came on board she provided a second opinion that terms limits could not be done, but noted again that Ruenzel was not on board when this originally came forward as she did not start until July.

Streckenbach stated you need to take personalities out of these different rulings, and he felt that if you brought ten attorneys into a room you would get ten different opinions based on the subject matter and the interpretation of law. Streckenbach continued that the question is do we need a Deputy Corporation Counsel and he felt that the answer was yes hands down. If personalities are taken out of the equation, the workload still stays there.

Ruenzel stated that she had previously worked in Door County where there were two corporation counsel positions for a county with a population of 30,000. She noted that Brown County has a population of 250,000 and there are two corporation counsels doing all the work. Fewell stated that one of the reasons they tried to get the attorneys together was because they were spending over \$200,000 in labor attorneys from a Madison labor firm while they had corporation counsel and an assistant corporation counsel on board and they wanted to try to get all of the attorneys underneath corporation counsel to keep track of what was being paid in legal fees because for a awhile legal fees were being paid out of Human Services, Human Resources and other places and nobody knew the true cost of the legal fees.

Steffen stated that there were mistakes on the specific matter referred to earlier. He felt that there were errors made across the board on this issue and he did agree that Ruenzel was not on staff in May when the opinion was submitted. However, Ruenzel came on in July and Steffen stated at that time there were nine more months of activity and discussions occurring on this matter. Steffen felt that Ruenzel must review with her deputies on a weekly or monthly basis what her staff is working on and he is guessing that term limits should have been included in these reviews. With regard to the matter of interpretation, Steffen felt that this does not seem like a gray area but was actually a complete and major oversight and he understands and shares with Supervisor Nicholson's concerns. The fact that new supervisors come on board with zero orientation, no handbook, not a review of processes may not be the best procedure and a little more effort should be put into this. This is obviously not the fault of any particular chairman or Executive, but is just something that as someone who came in without having any information is a struggle. Steffen continued that he had shared his thoughts with Corporation Counsel Ruenzel in terms of his concerns and disappointment with regard to the opinion and he accepted Ruenzel's apology in relation to the way things happened, but he did not feel we should be so clearly dismissive of the fact that there were significant errors that occurred and it was not just a matter of two separate opinions. It was a far more complex series of cascading errors that occurred but that aside the question is what should we do about it. Is it simply a standard operating procedure that corporation counsel in general addresses in the future with how items are reviewed so she is more aware of what her deputies are working on. When it comes to personnel, Steffen does not know what the Committee's role is and he asked if the Committee had the capability of making decisions on hiring and firing the deputy corporation counsel. Ruenzel stated that the Committee does not have that authority but statutorily she has the authority to hire and fire her

employees. Steffen asked who would have the authority to fire Ruenzel and she responded that it would be the County Executive as well as 2/3 of the Board.

Steffen continued that ultimately when it comes to quality control on employees, this rests primarily on the shoulders of the County Executive. Ruenzel wanted Steffen to rest assured that she did take all of his comments under advisement and she has required all of the assistants to give her weekly reports of what they are working on. Steffen admitted that they will probably never find perfect employees or perfect supervisors and errors will occur and are things we should learn from, but in this instance there were significant mistakes and he felt that that needs to be recognized and not dismissed.

Fewell stated that if Steffen felt the actions were egregious he could have a closed session put on the agenda, the employee would then be invited along with her attorney to attend and there would be a disciplinary hearing. Fewell stated that this matter was postponed and put off several times and he felt there was enough blame to go around. Fewell also stated that the 30 – 40 hours spent on this issue were probably spent before Ruenzel was on staff. Fewell advised Steffen that if he thought this was that egregious it could be addressed by the Board, but he has seen much more egregious things. Steffen asked for clarification on this as Fewell had previously stated that this body does not have the control over hiring and firing the deputy corporation counsel position. Ruenzel stated that the Committee has the ability to have a hearing and basically if he felt that someone has done something egregious the Board has the ability, within the Committee, to call a hearing in closed session, but when those hearings are done, by law you have to give the person notice as to what the hearing is going to be about and it is actually held like a mini trial to determine if there is fault and egregious actions on the party's part. Streckenbach stated that in order for this hearing to happen, some law would have had to be violated. Just because you don't agree with something they have done does not mean a law has been broken. Steffen said it sounded like the most the Committee or Board could do is provide a recommendation but do not have the ability to actually fire someone as a Committee or Board and Ruenzel stated that that was correct.

Fewell said that his argument has always been that there are department heads that serve below the County Executive and we have the County Executive and if we don't feel that department heads are doing what they should be doing we should be addressing the County Executive. Fewell continued that it comes down to everything else we are taking about in other areas and it comes down to if you trust the managers that are working for the County. He felt we either need to trust them or not have them working for us. To him, you need to say to department heads that department heads are doing a decent job and doing the best they can and they are running their departments well. If you don't feel this way, you need to contact the County Executive about that as the department heads do serve at the will of the County Executive.

Motion made by Supervisor De Wane, seconded by Supervisor Jamir to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Information Services

4. Director's Report.

No report was given as the position of Information Services Director is currently vacant.

Motion made by Supervisor De Wane, seconded by Supervisor Steffen to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Child Support

5. **Director's Report.**

Chair Fewell stated that he had been contacted by Child Support Director Maria Lasecki who was out of the office and therefore no report was given.

Motion made by Supervisor De Wane, seconded by Supervisor Steffen to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

County Clerk

Items 6-18 were removed from the agenda.

Department of Administration

19. **2013 Budget Adjustment Log.**

Motion made by Supervisor De Wane, seconded by Supervisor Steffen to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

20. **Asset Maintenance Fund Expenditures - Informational.**

Motion made by Supervisor De Wane, seconded by Supervisor Steffen to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

21. **Budget Adjustment Request (13-53) Category 4: Interdepartmental reallocation or adjustment (including reallocation from the County's General Fund).**

This budget adjustment relates to a hot water heater at the jail. The jail has two hot water heaters; one that serves the laundry and kitchen and the other which provides hot water for the inmate showers and restrooms. The larger of the two units failed. The smaller unit is presently providing hot water for the entire facility but there is no redundancy/backup system in place if this unit fails. Additionally, the water heater currently in operation is not reliable. Total cost of the project is \$75,614.00 including how water boilers, storage tanks, roof work and electrical work.

Motion made by Supervisor De Wane, seconded by Supervisor Jamir to approve the budget adjustment in the amount of \$75,614.00. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

22. **Director's Report.**

Motion made by Supervisor De Wane, seconded by Supervisor Jamir to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Human Resources

23. **Budget Status Financial Report for April and May, 2013.**

Motion made by Supervisor De Wane, seconded by Supervisor Jamir to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

24. **Activity Report for May, 2013.**

Motion made by Supervisor De Wane, seconded by Supervisor Steffen to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

25. **Changes in Short-Term Disability Plans.**

Interim HR Director Lynn Vanden Langenberg stated that she wanted to inform the Committee of changes to the short and long-term disability that the County offers to its employees. These changes are set forth on the attachment to the agenda, a copy of which is also attached to these minutes for review. Savings to the County with these changes would be about \$230,000 annually.

Fewell asked if these proposed changes are in line with other counties and Vanden Langenberg stated they are and stated that most short-term disability is paid at 66 2/3% and that brings it in line with what net pay would be so offering 75% is more in line with work comp.

Vanden Langenberg also stated with the new vendor there will be some added benefits such as an occupational health nurse here in Green Bay who will work with employees on short-term disability to try to get them back to work quicker.

De Wane asked who was worked with to get comparisons and Vanden Langenberg responded that initially they worked with the insurance consultant, M3, but they are looking at the other businesses that they work with and she also had a study from the Northeast Wisconsin Chamber Coalition of the Fox Valley which is where she got much of her information and this information lined up very closely with what the insurance company set forth.

Motion made by Supervisor De Wane, seconded by Supervisor Jamir to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

26. **Changes in Health Insurance Plan.**

Vanden Langenberg stated that they have been studying the cost of health insurance and the insurance consultant is estimating that insurance costs will rise 10% a year in the future. For Brown County this would mean about \$1.6 million dollars per year. In addition, there are some changes that need to be made with the Affordable Care Act. Fewell asked about moving employees to a high deductible plan and stated that his company had significant savings when employees were moved to the high deductible plan. Vanden Langenberg stated that there is savings with that but this is being projected due to the Affordable Care Act. Vanden Langenberg stated that all employees had been moved to the high deductible plan as of January 1, 2013.

Fewell asked if what he is hearing is that there is a \$3,000 maximum deductible for a family plan and Vanden Langenberg stated that that is correct for in network care. Out of network care would have a \$6,000 deductible. Fewell asked how much the County was paying towards that deductible and Vanden Langenberg answered that it was 80% and then employees are also eligible for wellness benefits for doing certain things such as getting their teeth cleaned. Vanden Langenberg stated that most groups fund the high deductible and if it performs well they pay 50% towards the deductible. Vanden Langenberg stated that the County used to pay 90% and scaled it back to 80%. The County was supposed to go to 70% and then to 50%, however, the County is still at 80%. On a long-term basis that cannot be sustained and Fewell agreed and stated he cannot even fathom paying 80% His employer has a \$6,000 family deductible and they get \$2,500 paid towards the deductible and if you are in a single plan the deductible is \$3,000 and they get \$1,000 paid towards the plan.

Streckenbach stated that this is something they are trying to manage better while, at the same time, recognizing that in the public realm there are a lot of things that are happening that we are trying to maintain a level of morale in the County as they turn the ship into the right direction. Fewell stated that the current plan sounds like a Cadillac plan and Streckenbach agreed.

Vanden Langenberg also pointed out that they looked at a number of different options on this and it was recommended to increase the premium by 10% but they are only recommending a 5% increase and then the employee contribution would be at 18% and this would have a \$32.00 per month impact on the employee and \$85.00 for family.

Streckenbach stated the health insurance fund balance was at \$9 million dollars two years ago and this has been utilized because it has been too high, but to the same point, it cannot be sustained at the level it is at so we are slowly graduating it down while trying to maintain it so it is at a level where it can be used in the event there is a high year of claims. In order for this to be adjusted, there are two choices. The premium can be kept where it is at and the County absorbs the \$1.6 million dollars and then we would have to find that in the operational budget or we share in that expense and that is what this is intended to do. Fewell stated that in the past, significant amounts of money were taken from that fund to bring down the tax levy artificially in some ways.

Vanden Langenberg also pointed out that premiums have not been raised in three years and that may be another thing that needs to be looked at is having a little bit of inflation each year but they did look at a number of options in this regard. Jamir asked what a sustainable amount would be and Vanden Langenberg stated they are shooting for 50% but that may mean that they have to raise the deductible. Vanden Langenberg also stated that they are encouraging better health for employees and plans such as this plan help the employees be more conscience of how they are spending health care dollars.

Streckenbach stated that by September, 2013 insured employees will have to undergo a health screening in order to get the better insurance plan. Employees will then have a year to work on improving areas of their health that need to be improved to create more of a partnership with the employees.

Fewell stated that he has seen similar models of this where companies actually hire a physician and the physician sees the employees and is able to minimize costs by helping to manage healthcare. Vanden Langenberg stated that insurance is a huge cost to the County and is one of the costs that will rise faster than any other costs so we have to stay on top of this. Streckenbach also stated that our claims are \$20 million dollars which is one of the largest areas of cost impact to the County.

Motion made by Supervisor De Wane, seconded by Supervisor Jamir to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

27. Director's Report.

Motion made by Supervisor De Wane, seconded by Supervisor Jamir to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Corporation Counsel

- 28. Closed Session: The Administration Committee will convene in closed session to confer with legal counsel regarding the pending litigation in Getmor Enterprises, LLC v. Brown County, et al., U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin, Case No. 12-C-633. Per Wis. Stat., § 19.85(1)(g), a closed session may be held for purposes of conferring with legal counsel for the governmental body who is rendering oral or written advice concerning strategy to be adopted by the body with respect to litigation in which it is or is likely to become involved.**

Motion made by Supervisor De Wane, seconded by Supervisor Jamir to enter into closed session. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Roll Call: Present: Jamir, Steffen, Fewell, De Wane

Motion made by Supervisor De Wane, seconded by Supervisor Jamir to return to regular order of business. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Roll Call: Present: Jamir, Steffen, Fewell, De Wane

Treasurer – No agenda items.

Other

29. **Audit of bills.**

Motion made by Supervisor De Wane, seconded by Supervisor Steffen to pay the bills. Vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

30. **Such other matters as authorized by law.**

None.

31. **Adjourn.**

Motion made by Supervisor De Wane, seconded by Supervisor Jamir to adjourn at 7:03 p.m. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Respectfully submitted,

Blaire Xiong
Recording Secretary

Therese Giannunzio
Transcriptionist

Short-Term and Long-Term Disability Plans

Brown County provides its employees short-term and long-term disability benefits. Below is a summary of the current plan, market data, and the recommended changes to the current plan.

Short-term Disability (self-funded)			
	Current plan	Market Data*	Proposed Plan
Elimination period - accident	3	0	0
Elimination period - sickness	3	7	7
Family member	7 day benefit	N/A	Eliminate
Percent of wages paid	75%	60%	60%
Duration	180 days		180 days
Number of claims per year	222		212
Number of claims days	8751		7863
Claim costs	\$700,000		\$470,000
Amount paid by employer	100%	71% - 100% 17.5% - 0%	100%

Items in italics are expected results with proposed plan.

Note – Departments are charged for the first two weeks (use of accrued benefits for waiting period and benefit days). The Short-term Disability fund is charged with the balance. The cost savings of \$230,000 will be in both the department budgets and the Short-term Disability fund.

Long-term Disability (fully insured)			
	Current plan	Market Data*	Proposed Plan
Monthly benefits	66 2/3% to \$5,000	60%	66 2/3% to \$5,000
Elimination period	180 days		180 days
Duration	ADEA with NRA		Normal Retirement Age
Definition of disability	Own Occupation Only		Own Occupation OR Any Occupation
Rate per \$100	.38		.37
Premiums	\$254,382		\$247,687
Amount paid by Brown County	100%	71.7% - 100% 17.2% - 0%	100%

Added Benefits:

- \$25,000 Reasonable Accommodation Benefit
- Lifetime Security Benefits
- Return to Work Incentive
- Employee Assistance – hot line, face-to-face counseling, goal and success planning, legal consultation, identity theft, financial consulting
- Vocational RN on-site as needed

*Market Data taken from Northeast Wisconsin Chambers Coalition Benefit Survey 2012-2013

- 58% begin accident coverage on Day 1
- 75% begin illness coverage on Day 8
- 70.5% pay 60% of wages
- 19.2% of employers responding do not offer Short-Term Disability
- 15.7% of employers responding do not offer Long-Term Disability

Health Insurance Plan

Brown County health insurance plan is self-funded. The market is expecting health care costs to increase at least 10% or \$1.58 million (Medical \$1,230,000, Pharmacy \$350,000). There are requirements of the Affordable Healthcare Act that impact the cost of the health insurance plan (fee of \$219,144).

Although this is a high deductible plan, the deductible has been funded using the fund balance that had accumulated in years past plus wellness incentives. Deductible funding and wellness incentives allowed for a low/no net deductible.

The funding of the deductible was scheduled to decrease over time, with a target of 50% on a continuous basis if plan performance allows (use of fund balance). Premiums have not increased in three years.

Due to the expected increases in health care costs, the following changes are recommended for 2014:

- Increase premiums by 5% - increase employee participation in premium from 12% to 18%. Monthly increase for employees - single \$48.54; family \$129.17 (less pre-tax reduction).
- Decrease deductible percent paid by fund balance from 80% to 70%. New employees will be funded at 50%. In 2015, all employees will be funded at 50% if plan performance allows.
- Increase Wellness Incentives by \$50 (Single) and \$100 (Family). Change co-insurance from 100% to 90%. Increase maximum of out of pocket by \$1,000.
- Introduce Health Risk Assessment (HRA), with baseline measurements taken in September 2013.
 - Non-participation in 2013 HRA penalty - additional 3% of premium (from 18% to 21%)
 - During 2014 - employees and spouse work with Occupational Health Nurse to improve Health Risk Assessment score
 - September 2014 - HRA score is used to determine the percent of premium paid by employee for 2015 (Healthy score = less premium paid by employee)

Health Plan				
	Current Single	Proposed Single	Current Family	Proposed Family
Monthly premium - employees	\$539.33	\$566.30	\$1,435.19	\$1,506.95
Monthly premium - retiree (+2% admin fee)	\$539.33	\$582.48	\$1,435.19	\$1,550.01
Employer/employee % with HRA participation	88%/12%	82%/18%	88%/12%	82%/18%
Employer/employee % if no participation in HRA	N/A	79%/21%	N/A	79%/21%
In-network deductible	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$3,000	\$3,000
Out-of-network deductible	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$6,000	\$6,000
Deductible paid by fund – current employees	80% (\$1,200)	70% (\$1,050)	80% (\$2,400)	70% (\$2,100)
Wellness Incentives	\$200	\$250	\$400	\$500
Deductible paid by fund – new employees	80% (\$1,200)	50% (\$750)	80% (\$2,400)	50% (\$1,500)
Max out of pocket – in network	\$1,500	\$2,500	\$3,000	\$4,000
Max out of pocket – out of network	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$12,000	\$12,000
Co-insurance – in network	100%	90%	100%	90%
Co-insurance – out of network	70%	70%	70%	70%

Health Insurance Plan

Brown County Health Insurance Plan Compared to Market Data			
	Current	Proposed	Market Data*
Monthly premium - single	\$539.33	\$566.30	53.6% \$300 - \$499 26.8% \$500 - \$699
Monthly premium - family	\$1,435.19	\$1,506.95	66.1% - >\$1,100
% paid by Employer	88%	80%	36% - 80% - 99% 35.1% - 60% - 79%
Deductible for HDHP with HRA	Single - \$1,500 Family - \$3,000	Single - \$1,500 Family - \$3,000	29.4% - \$1,500 23.5% - \$2,000 5.9% - \$2,500 11.8% - \$3,000
Dollar amount contributed to HRA	Single - \$1,200 Family - \$2,400	Single - \$1,050 Family - \$2,100	72.2% - \$1,000 - \$1,999
New Employees	Single - \$1,200 Family - \$2,400	Single - \$750 Family - \$1,500	

*Market Data is from Northeast Wisconsin Chambers Coalition Benefit Survey Fox Valley 2012 - 2013